UNITED NATIONS

SECURITY COUNCIL
OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2593rd MEETING: 17 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	Page
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2593)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);	
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);	
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council.* The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council.* The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2593rd MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 17 June 1985, at 10.30 a.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2593)

1. Adoption of the agenda

2. The situation in Namibia:
   (*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
   (*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
   (*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 11.15 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:
(*a*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
(*b*) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
(*c*) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ouyahia, Acting President, and the other members of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [*2583rd to 2587th, 2589th, 2590th and 2592nd meetings*], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaieh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mrs. Carrasco (Bolivia), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Gayama (Congo), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Foldeak (Hungary), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan (Kuwait), Mr.

Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Makeka (Lesotho), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Gauci (Malta), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Murargy (Mozambique), Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera Jovane (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Odaka (Uganda), Mr. Al-Mosfir, (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to draw the attention of members of the Council to document S/17272, which contains the text of a letter dated 13 June 1985 from the representative of Venezuela to the Secretary-General.

6. The first speaker is the Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, Mr. Abdul G. Koroma. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. KOROMA (Chairman of the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples): Since its inception, and in the discharge of the mandate entrusted to it, namely, to ensure that peoples of dependent Territories exercise their legitimate right to self-determination and independence, the Special Committee has considered the question of Namibia's independence to be of supreme importance. This year, as it commemorates the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Special Committee's commitment to and determination to work towards Namibia's freedom and independence have become even more resolute. It is for this reason that we have requested the Council's permission to speak to make known the Special Committee's latest position on this all-important matter.

8. Before proceeding further, however, I wish, on behalf of the Special Committee and on my own personal behalf, to congratulate you, Sir, on assuming the presidency for this month. It is with considerable interest and hope that the Special Committee views the assumption of the presidency by Trinidad and Tobago, the country which you so ably represent in this body, on this important occasion, for your country is a firm believer in the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and a courageous defender of the principles of the Non-Aligned Movement. Furthermore, the commitment of the people and the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to the cause of colonial peoples and their outstanding contribution to the work of the United Nations in the field of decolonization, in particular as an exemplary member of the Special Committee, give us hope that, under your stewardship, the just cause of the freedom and independence of the Namibian people will make further advances.

9. I should like also to congratulate the representative of Thailand on the excellent manner in which he presided over the affairs of the Council last month. We acknowledge with gratitude and appreciation the steadfast support of his Government and his people for the cause of the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence.

10. The importance and urgency attached to the situation in Namibia are clearly demonstrated by the active participation in these Council meetings of a number of ministers and other high officials from all regions of the world. Indeed, the current series of meetings of the Council constitute an unequivocal demonstration of the serious concern shared by members of the Group of African States, the Non-Aligned Movement and, indeed, the international community as a whole about the current turn of events with regard to the Territory, and underscore our determination to see that all effective measures open to the United Nations are taken to eliminate a situation which constitutes a serious threat to international peace and security.

11. South Africa's open defiance of the will of the international community in respect of Namibia and South Africa is a damaging affront to the Organization, and must not be permitted to continue any further, as it seriously undermines the very principles on the basis of which it was founded.

12. As members of the Council are aware, South Africa's continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its denial of the right to self-determination of the Namibian people constitute serious breaches of its international obligations, which renders it criminally reprehensible. Accordingly, the international community, as institutionalized by the Council, is under the obligation to continue to deny recognition to the illegal situation created by South Africa, to deny aid or assistance to South Africa in maintaining that situation, and to terminate its illegal presence in Namibia forthwith.

13. As members of the Council are also aware, the Special Committee held at Tunis from 13 to 17 May 1985 an extraordinary session in observance of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. Following extensive deliberations on the theme of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration, the main focus of which was on Namibia, the Special Committee, guided by its mandate to ensure that the peoples of colonial Territories and countries are enabled to exercise their right to self-determination and independence, adopted unanimously—I repeat: unanimously—a decision on the question of Namibia.[1]

14. In that consensus decision, the Special Committee, among other things, holds the *apartheid* régime of South Africa accountable for creating a situation which seriously threatens international peace and security, as a result of its persistent non-compliance with and violations of United Nations resolutions and decisions, its ruthless resort to

repression of and violence against the Namibian people, its repeated acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against neighbouring States, its continued manoeuvres to subvert the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978), and its sinister attempts to impose on the people of Namibia an internal settlement.

15. The Special Committee categorically rejects and denounces all manoeuvres by South Africa to bring about a sham independence in Namibia through fraudulent constitutional and political schemes designed to perpetuate its colonial domination, including the latest attempts by the Pretoria régime to impose an internal settlement through the so-called Multi-Party Conference, and to establish an interim government.

16. The Special Committee is convinced that any political solution to the Namibian situation must be based on the immediate and unconditional termination of South Africa's illegal occupation of the Territory, the withdrawal of its armed forces and the free and unfettered exercise by the Namibian people of their right to self-determination and independence, in accordance with General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960. Thus, the Special Committee calls for the immediate implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978), the only acceptable basis for a peaceful settlement of the Namibian question, without modification, qualification or pre-conditions.

17. In condemning the continued military, nuclear and intelligence collaboration between South Africa and certain countries as constituting a violation of the arms embargo imposed by the Council against South Africa in its resolution 418 (1977), the Special Committee urges that the Security Council adopt further measures to widen the scope of the embargo in order to make it more effective and comprehensive.

18. Furthermore, the Special Committee recommends that the Council act, and act decisively, against any dilatory manoeuvres and fraudulent schemes of the illegal occupation régime aimed at frustrating the legitimate struggle of the Namibian people. Aware that the Council has been prevented from discharging effectively its responsibilities for the maintenance of international peace and security in the region owing to the opposition of certain of its permanent members, the Special Committee recommends that the Council respond, and respond positively, to the overwhelming demand of the international community by imposing forthwith comprehensive mandatory sanctions against South Africa under the terms of Chapter VII of the Charter.

19. These and other equally important recommendations are embodied in the decision adopted unanimously by the Special Committee at its extraordinary session. On behalf of the Special Committee, I commend them to the serious attention of members of the Council. The repeated attempts to bring about an independent, stable, self-governing and democratic Namibia, by the exercise of reason and through negotiations at an international level, have been ignored and, worse yet, ridiculed by the racist régime, as has been amply demonstrated by its recent act of aggression against Botswana.

20. As representative of Sierra Leone, I should like to say in this context that my Government has learned with indignation of South Africa's latest lawless behaviour in carrying out a wanton act of armed aggression against Botswana, which resulted in the death of innocent men and women, and at least one six-year-old child. The Government of Sierra Leone strongly condemns that wanton use of force and that act of brigandage by South Africa against a Member State. This latest attempt to intimidate an independent African State, or to cow it into submission and to make it accept a so-called treaty of non-aggression with ignominious conditions, is bound to fail. South Africa is deluding itself if it believes that *apartheid* and internal peace are compatible or can coexist. Moreover, South Africa's acts of aggression and destabilization against independent African States constitute a serious threat to the peace and security of that region.

21. The Government of Sierra Leone therefore calls upon the Council to ensure that South Africa desist from its illegal and aggressive behaviour. In this connection, Sierra Leone welcomes the condemnation of the raid by the international community, and in particular by the United States and the United Kingdom Governments. South Africa should be left in no doubt that it can find sympathy in no quarter for its illegal use of force. South Africa's latest action against an independent and peaceful Botswana is further demonstration that it cannot be trusted and that it cannot be regarded as a respectable member of the international community. Furthermore, it demonstrates that South Africa is not interested in a peaceful solution to the problems of *apartheid* that it has itself created.

22. The time is therefore overdue for the Council to act positively by imposing on South Africa a comprehensive programme of economic sanctions. At the same time, measures must be adopted without delay to extend all possible assistance to the struggling people of Namibia under the leadership of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO). That is the very least we should expect if we are not to see the present armed struggle degenerate into a full-scale war with all its dire consequences.

23. Before concluding, may I be permitted to express my deep appreciation to States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries for having taken this important initiative to call for this series of Council meetings on the situation in Namibia. With the full co-operation of the members of the Organization of African Unity (OAU), I have no doubt whatsoever that the decisions adopted by the Council during these meetings will prove to be a decisive factor in restoring to the people of Namibia their long-denied human dignity and freedom. Delay is the worst form of denial.

24. In conclusion, I wish to express my appreciation for this opportunity to address the Council in connection with its consideration of the critical situation which prevails in the Territory of Namibia at this moment in time.

25. I should also like to pay a particular tribute to our Secretary-General for his tireless endeavours in the search

for a satisfactory solution to the problem of Namibia and his personal commitment to the cause of the people of Namibia.

26. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Zimbabwe. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

27. Mr. MUDENGE (Zimbabwe): Let me begin, Sir, by congratulating you most sincerely on your assumption of the presidency for the month of June. My delegation is confident that your wisdom, experience and vast diplomatic skills will enable you successfully to guide the deliberations of the Council.

28. I also wish to join the many others who have spoken before me in extending appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the competent and outstanding manner in which he presided over the affairs of the Council during the month of May.

29. And, finally, I am grateful to you and your colleagues in the Council for allowing my delegation to participate in the debate on the question of Namibia.

30. Before I make my statement on Namibia, I wish to draw the attention of the members of the Council to a statement issued by my Government on the bloody events in Gaborone last week [*S/17278, annex*].

31. The Council meets at a sombre moment for the Namibian people. For years now they have seen their hopes raised, only to be dashed to the ground time and again. They have heard of near breakthroughs, effusively described, but which came to naught; they have heard of hushed airborne diplomatic forays in the African night skies, but which led to nowhere. They have seen their leaders and allies pressured to make concessions and compromises in the so-called proximity talks, pre-implementation talks, shuttle consultations, talks about talks, but these have turned out to be talks about nothing; they have also heard about détente, constructive engagement, linkages and parallelisms, but all this plethora of diplomatic mumbo-jumbo and geometry has yielded nothing. They are still an oppressed and brutalized nation. Namibia is still an occupied territory.

32. It is now nearly 70 years since Namibia was taken over in 1915 from Germany by South Africa, on behalf of the British Empire; and it is 25 years since the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted. All the former German colonies are now free and independent. Yet the people of Namibia have remained under the yoke of colonialism and racist oppression.

33. I recall these events in order to underline the moral and legal obligation of the world community, and in particular that of some of the Powers allied during the First World War, to the Namibian people. There are members in this Council who by their actions and inactions, both present and past, bear a heavy moral responsibility for the tragedy that is Namibia. As so many other speakers have underlined, the Mandate given to South Africa by the League of Nations to hold the Territory of Namibia in "trust" on behalf of mankind was subsequently revoked by the General Assembly in resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966, by the Security Council in numerous resolutions—in particular resolution 269 (1969)—and by the International Court of Justice in its advisory opinion handed down on 21 June 1971.[2]

34. The presence of Pretoria in Namibia is therefore devoid of both legal and moral validity. It is based on the power of a bandit holding hostages. Hence it is in the light of these facts that we should judge the installation of a so-called interim administration in Namibia. This administration is a creature of illegitimate parentage and by definition is itself illegitimate. From illegality only the illegal can result. The Council in its resolution 439 (1978), *inter alia*, reiterated the view that any transfer of power, in contravention of the United Nations resolutions, including resolution 439 (1978) is null and void. It was therefore only appropriate that the Council, in a note by the President of 3 May 1985 [*S/17151*], rejected the so-called interim administration as null and void. In the same spirit, the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries, at its Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi from 19 to 21 April 1985, condemned and rejected Pretoria's recent manoeuvre as being fraudulent and without validity in law whatsoever [*see S/17184 and Corr.1, annex*]. We hope therefore that on this point there will be no equivocation by any member of the Council.

35. The events taking place in Windhoek today are a desperate and futile attempt to hijack the Namibian independence plan. The Council must unreservedly condemn this strategem by the racist Pretoria régime.

36. South Africa's conduct in the Namibia independence negotiations has lacked candour and integrity. It is a story of duplicity, deviousness, insincerity, arrogance, obstinacy and obstructionism. Its behaviour in the negotiations leading to Security Council resolution 435 (1978) and since then is a vivid demonstration of this. During the so-called proximity talks or "shuttle consultations", held in New York in 1978, South Africa stormed out of the negotiations claiming that the gap was too wide to justify further talks. It then went on to enact the notorious Proclamation A.G. 26 of 1978, under which it incarcerated hundreds of leaders of SWAPO. From there it proceeded to send its troops into Angola, where they massacred hundreds of unarmed Namibian refugees in the camp at Cuamato. It resorted to all those machinations in a desperate attempt to sabotage the negotiations.

37. But SWAPO remained resolute and steadfast in the face of all that calculated provocation. Methodically it dismantled all South Africa's objections until Pretoria could find no more ground on which to deny Namibia its independence. Consequently, South Africa was forced to accept the United Nations plan for Namibia's independence embodied in resolution 435 (1978). But no sooner had it accepted that resolution than it proceeded to undermine it by conducting

its unilateral and sham "elections" in Namibia in 1978. Then the wriggling, twisting and turning started again, until by 1980 the international community thought it had virtually struck a deal with the *apartheid* régime for it to get out of Namibia. Thus the United Nations called for a pre-implementation conference at Geneva in 1981 to go over the details of the modalities and instrumentalities of the Namibia independence plan as embodied in resolution 435 (1978).

38. Alas, it soon became clear that South Africa's intransigence had found encouragement from some quarters in Washington during the 1980 American presidential elections. The result was that the Geneva meeting became a charade, a mere farce, with South Africa giving the alleged partiality of the United Nations as its nebulous reason for walking out.

39. Sadly, it also became clear that Pretoria's reading of the signals from Washington were well founded. For, when the new Administration articulated its policy on southern Africa, it introduced its apologia for *apartheid*, known today as the policy of "constructive engagement". This strategy, we were given to understand, was meant to bring about peace and understanding among the nations of southern Africa, as well as Namibian independence. In the name of "constructive engagement", the new Administration radically changed what we had come to believe to be the position of every United States Government, that is, to tell publicly to South Africa that its *apartheid* system and aggressive disposition towards its neighbours were the root causes of violence in the region.

40. Instead, by what can only be described as a perverse twist of moral philosophy, "constructive engagement", for the first time, equated the brutal violence of an oppressive system that the international community had declared to be a crime against humanity, with the force used by its victims to resist it. How can we, in the name of humanity, equate the violence of the Gestapo and SS murder squads with the resistance of the victims of the holocaust? It is a horrible perversion of logic to describe South Africa's aggression against its neighbours as justified "protective action". Since when can the protection of an institutionalized crime against humanity be regarded as justified? It is immoral to lecture and pressure the front-line States and SWAPO into acquiescing in the existence of the evil system of *apartheid* in Namibia and South Africa. Short of its verbal trappings and mental gymnastics, that is what "constructive engagement" amounts to. It has no moral basis, and it has yielded no positive results.

41. We speak strongly against this policy, because we believe that it was its inception that introduced the tragic concept of "linkage" to the Namibian independence issue. To South Africa, the linkage of Namibian independence to the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola was an unexpected opportunity to transform its colonial racist occupation of Namibia into a global ideological crusade—the defence of the so-called Western Christian civilization against imaginary Russians in southern Africa. Here, a simple matter of decolonization and racial oppression was elevated and given a global dimension. South Africa now hides its colonial racist objectives behind American global concerns. It is as if the United States has now become a toll used by South Africa to promote its racist policies. The springbok has charmed the American eagle into its racist snare. And we see the eagle's wings hopelessly entrapped as it tries to give the impression that great changes are taking place in South Africa as a result of its policies. Every twist and turn by the *apartheid* régime is presented with great fanfare by transatlantic satellite communications.

42. In this propaganda battle, logic has been turned on its head. The creation of three parliaments where there used to be one is presented as a "new dispensation" meant to unite the people of South Africa. The fact that this is consistent with *apartheid*—the doctrine of separation—is conveniently forgotten. Its divisive strategy of trying to incorporate the Indian and Coloured communities to reinforce the *apartheid* edifice dominated by an Afrikaner minority is brushed aside. Since when is the reinforcement of the instrumentalities of oppression to be regarded as a positive reform?

43. The other day we were told in this chamber that great strides were being made because South Africans were now free to marry whom they wished. But where will these multiracial couples live? The Group Areas Act forbids the husband to live in the same area as his wife—and, of course, the children cannot live with either of the parents. This is an absurdity. How can anybody be hoodwinked by such gimmicks? *Apartheid* is about sharing power between the 80 per cent black majority and the white minority. It is not, I submit, about who goes to bed with whom. It is really an insult to our intelligence to present the removal of the so-called petty *apartheid* as if it were the fundamental question in South Africa. It is definitely not.

44. The present American Administration is wrong if it believes that the *apartheid* edifice is crumbling and that President Botha is somehow the South African equivalent of a twentieth-century Abraham Lincoln who needs our support and understanding. He is not; and trying to give him an aura of international respectability by wining and dining him in the capitals of Western Europe is a tragic error of judgement.

45. The aforementioned interpretation of the policy of "constructive engagement" is the most generous that one can give it. The alternative to this pathetic imagery of an immobilized giant reduced to sycophancy by a crafty racist régime is that of collusion between South Africa and the United States Administration. Recent events in southern Angola, where we saw a Mr. Lehrman and his motley band of rebels plotting subversion and treason against Angola and other States in southern Africa, make us stop and think again about United States policy towards our region. We understand that this Mr. Lehrman carried a message of encouragement from none other than President Reagan to Jonas Savimbi, the leader of the South African-sponsored bandits in Angola and his confederates.

46. The role of the United States as a would-be honest broker on the Namibian question is now most problematic.

It seems the United States has now become part of the problem. Certainly the South African Prime Minister came very close to letting the cat out of the bag when speaking in the South African Parliament on 18 April this year. He is reported, *inter alia*, to have said:

> "However, as I told Parliament on 27 April 1984, the people of South West Africa/Namibia, including SWAPO, cannot wait indefinitely for a breakthrough on the withdrawal of the Cubans from Angola. Should it eventually become evident, after all avenues have been thoroughly explored, that there is no realistic prospect of attaining this goal, all the parties most intimately affected by the present negotiations will obviously have to reconsider how internationally acceptable independence may best be attained in the light of prevailing circumstances." [*See 17/52, appendix 2.*]

47. Put most simply, the issue of the Cuban presence in Angola is an American concern, which South Africa is using for convenience for the time being. If it can create an amenable régime in Namibia it intends to leave the linkage baby with its American parents. That that is so is evidenced by the fact that when Angola made some important concessions on the subject last year, South Africa spurned them for it was not sure of the emergence of a puppet régime in Namibia.

48. For all those reasons it has now become imperative that we officially and symbolically bring the Namibian independence negotiation process back to where it belongs—the United Nations. It is only the Secretary-General who now has both the legal and moral authority to mediate. Others have undermined their credibility as mediators by attempting to bring extraneous issues into the negotiation process. They have become part of the obstacles to be removed.

49. Finally, my delegation wishes to place on record its admiration for, and appreciation of, the tremendous efforts the Secretary-General has made to try to resolve the Namibia problem and appeals to all members of the Council to rally behind him as he reasserts the authority of the United Nations on the Namibia issue. He needs the full support of the Council.

50. Let the Council send a clear, unambiguous message to the Pretoria racists that the game is up. If they do not comply now, the Council should show that it has the determination and political will to act, and act decisively. Let the Council give a lead to the world by warning South Africa that it is prepared to impose and implement mandatory sanctions if no progress is made on this issue. For outside this chamber there are ordinary men and women from all walks of life, as well as legislators and Governments, already grappling with these issues. They are desperately trying to send urgent and strong messages to the South African régime by their campaigns of disinvestment and other sanctions. The Council should not fail those men and women of good will, and should not betray the people of Namibia. It should not be a Council of cynicism and despair; it should be a Council of hope. The time to act is now. Tomorrow may be too late.

51. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Czechoslovakia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

52. Mr. CÉSAR (Czechoslovakia): Mr. President, I should like to thank you and all the members of the Council for having given me this opportunity to address the Council during its deliberations on the very serious issue on the current agenda. I also wish to congratulate you sincerely, on your assumption of the presidency for this month and to express my conviction that your distinguished personal qualities, diplomatic skills and experience are a guarantee of the successful fulfilment of the Council's mandate. Your country, Trinidad and Tobago, has for many years been an active member of the Special Committee against *Apartheid* and the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, organs which are obliged to include among their priorities consideration of the pernicious consequences of the racist and colonial policies of the Government of South Africa.

53. I should also like to express our appreciation of the performance of the representative of Thailand in the office of President of the Council in May.

54. The question of Namibia has for long years been raising ever-growing concerns. The Council is compelled to deal with this problem, the essence of which is connected with attempts to perpetuate persisting colonialism, the enforcement of neo-colonial diktat, flagrant violations of the norms of international law, disregard of the conclusions of the United Nations and of the will of world public opinion, escalation of tension and the endangering of peace in southern Africa. The Pretoria régime prolongs the illegal occupation of Namibia, trampling underfoot the inalienable right of the Namibians to self-determination and independence, militarizing Namibia and escalating military, police and judicial repression and terror, carrying out consistent exploitation of the natural, mineral and human resources of Namibia, transferring to Namibia the inhuman practices of *apartheid* and launching from Namibian territory acts of aggression, subversion and destabilization against independent African States.

55. It is imperialism, with its attempts to prevent the consistent elimination of all remnants of colonialism and racism in the region, that has caused the present situation in Namibia and in the whole of southern Africa. It is in accordance with the strategic interests and intentions of imperialism that Pretoria has been blocking the efforts of the international community to solve the Namibian question and obstructing the implementation of the series of resolutions on that question adopted by the Council. In the interests of United States strategy in the south of Africa, it has raised the totally unjustified demand to link Namibia's independence to the departure of internationalist Cuban troops from Angola, where those troops assist, upon the request of the legitimate Government of the People's Republic of Angola, in combating the acts of aggression and subversion perpetrated by the South African régime.

56. Time and again Pretoria has launched new attempts designed to perpetuate its domination in Namibia. The latest—the unilateral plan for a so-called internal settlement—has rightly been rejected by the whole international community. This action, null and void since its very inception, constitutes nothing but an attempt to bantustanize Namibia.

57. The seriousness of the situation in Namibia and the necessity of a resolute and speedy solution were convincingly explained at the beginning of the current discussion by Mr. Nujoma, President of SWAPO, the sole authentic representative of the Namibian people. He also pointed out the obstacles preventing the immediate implementation of self-determination for the Namibian people and fulfilment of the United Nations plan. They include primarily the many-sided support granted to the Pretoria régime by certain Western States and Israel. This support is motivated by the ideological, global, strategic as well as economic interests of imperialism and provided mainly in the spirit of the discredited policy of so-called constructive engagement.

58. The ways towards termination of the suffering of the Namibian people are set forth very clearly in the series of conclusions of our Organization embodied primarily in Council resolution 385 (1976), 435 (1978) and 539 (1983). At the time of our Organization's fortieth jubilee, when we are reviewing the contributions of the United Nations to the solution of the world's problems and the role of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted 25 years ago, the imperative to put those conclusions into practice acquires ever stronger topicality and urgency. The legacy of the victory over fascism and nazism in the Second World War undoubtedly commits all of us to seeking speedy ways of preventing further crimes against the Namibians and immediately ensuring Namibia's independence.

59. The Government and people of Czechoslovakia resolutely condemn the continuing illegal occupation of Namibia by the racist régime of South Africa and demand that the Namibian people immediately be granted independence and that the territorial integrity of Namibia, including Walvis Bay and the offshore islands, be maintained. We stand for immediate implementation of the decisions of the United Nations on this question. We reject any attempts to link the question of Namibia's decolonization with any issues irrelevant to it or with any other demands. We oppose all of Pretoria's attempts at a so-called internal settlement of the Namibian problem on neo-colonialist terms outside the framework of the United Nations and without the participation of SWAPO.

60. As was noted during the visit to Prague last March of a SWAPO delegation headed by the Secretary-General of that Organization, Mr. Toïvo Ya Toïvo, the Czechoslovak Government and people are in full solidarity with the struggle for freedom and independence being waged by the Namibian people under the leadership of their sole authentic representative, SWAPO. Czechoslovakia is ready to continue granting that struggle its determined and all-round support. We unequivocally advocate the adoption without delay of effective measures, including sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, that would make the Pretoria régime terminate its illegal occupation of Namibia, liquidate the inhuman system of *apartheid* and stop subversive activities in the south of the African continent. We are convinced that the present deliberations of the Council should lead to the adoption of effective measures to that end.

61. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Guyana. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

62. Mr. SINCLAIR (Guyana): The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Mr. Rashleigh Jackson, sends his deepest regrets to his colleagues, within the Non-Aligned Movement and outside it, for his inability to be present in New York for this series of meetings.

63. My second duty is to thank you, Mr. President, and all the members of the Council for having acceded to our request to participate in the debate.

64. At no other time in the history of the question of Namibia has the Organization's resolve to defend the rights and interests of the Namibian people been so sorely tested as it is being tested now. For, as the Secretary-General has pointed out in his report of 6 June [*S/17242*], the prevailing difficulties with regard to this question have been compounded and given a new dimension by the recent decision of South Africa to install a puppet administration in Namibia.

65. Our delegation is participating at a very late stage of what has been a lengthy debate. This debate has served, among other things, to underscore and to strengthen the almost universal consensus that already exists about Namibia's freedom. It is a consensus that is well founded.

66. In 1966 the General Assembly terminated South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and made the United Nations responsible for the future of the Territory. In 1971 the International Court of Justice, in an advisory opinion,[1] stated that the Assembly had acted correctly, that South Africa's continued presence in Namibia was illegal, that States were under an obligation to recognize that illegality and to refrain from any acts which might appear to imply a recognition of that illegal presence. In that same year the Council adopted resolution 301 (1971), in which it endorsed the Court's advisory opinion.

67. My delegation does not recall an issue on the international agenda in respect of which three organs of the United Nations, each acting independently of the others, have spoken in such unison and clarity and forcefulness. This is surely one aspect of the uniqueness of Namibia. But it is not in this fact, which is of profound importance in its own way, that the consensus on Namibia is rooted. That consensus is rooted in the fact that, under contemporary international law, colonialism constitutes a denial of basic human rights and essential political freedoms, colonial occupation is illegal, and people subjected to alien domination and exploita-

tion have the right of self-determination, a right which predates even the creation of the Organization.

68. While condemning and rejecting South Africa's creation of a so-called interim government in Namibia, speakers in the current debate have also reaffirmed the centrality of resolution 435 (1978) and the need for its immediate implementation. In addition, they have highlighted the international community's stern rejection of linkage of Namibia's independence with the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola. The people of Namibia must be free because it is their right to be free. Exercise of that right cannot be circumscribed or made conditional. As President Nyerere of Tanzania has argued, it is only by accident that Angola is a neighbour of Namibia. What is the difference between an insistence on Cuban withdrawal from Angola and an insistence that Namibia will not be free until Soviet troops are withdrawn from Afghanistan, or, for example, until Vietnamese troops are withdrawn from Kampuchea? This conditioning of Namibia's freedom upon the solution of problems elsewhere is not only irrelevant; it is simply immoral.

69. The debate in the Council has also served further to isolate the rulers in Pretoria as the party responsible for Namibia's continued domination. There is universal rejection of the policies of *apartheid* and aggression practised by the Pretoria régime, and that régime is identified as the one whose actions pose the gravest threat to peace and security in southern Africa.

70. As if this needed further confirmation, the Pretoria régime last week launched a brutal attack on Botswana, in violation of that territory's independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity. This attack took place even while the Council was considering the question of Namibia.

71. The President of Guyana, Mr. Linden Forbes Sampson Burnham, in a message to the President of Botswana, Mr. Quett K. J. Masire, stated:

> "The Government and people of Guyana are shocked at the brutal invasion by the armed forces of South Africa of the independent and peace-loving nation of Botswana and by the cold-blooded murder of innocent people in its capital, Gaborone.
>
> "Guyana condemns in the strongest possible terms this latest in the long list of callous acts of aggression by South Africa against neighbouring African States . . .
>
> "The Government and people of Guyana call upon all peace-loving and progressive forces to join together in renewed efforts to isolate South Africa in all fields and to bring about the dismantling of the odious system of *apartheid*.
>
> "Similarly we urge upon those who continue to give succour to the *apartheid* régime to review and alter their relations with Pretoria."

72. The Guyana delegation has seen the draft resolution [*S/17284*] which is being considered for adoption by the Council, and has studied it carefully. We consider that if this draft were to be adopted in its present form the Council would be showing consistency. As long ago as 1969 [*resolution 269 (1969)*], the Council had decided that in the event of failure by South Africa to co-operate in implementation of its resolutions, it would meet immediately to determine upon necessary steps in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations. That was 16 years ago. The Council has never gone beyond that pronouncement where the relations of South Africa with Namibia are concerned. Since then what the Council has been doing is temporizing where South Africa is concerned—acting evasively in order to gain time, postponing the real decision, seeking what options might exist short of taking the action that has the support of the overwhelming majority in the international community. Once again, in 1985, the Council seems poised to decide to meet again to decide on what to do about South Africa's non-co-operation.

73. This attitude on the part of the Council has contributed in no small measure to bolstering and giving a sense of protection to the Pretoria régime. The body responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security is, by its inaction, indirectly giving comfort to the régime that poses such a grave threat to peace and security in southern Africa.

74. In the course of the debate, the Council has been the object of much forthright comment by several delegations, including my own. The Council, after all, is a very exposed and prominent body. What is more, it has clear obligations in respect of the maintenance of international peace and security, and Member States look to it to respond credibly to situations where peace and security are imperiled, and more so where its own authority is being flouted. But as we review the Council's performance in respect of Namibia, it is important and only fair that we maintain proper perspective and not see the Security Council as an undifferentiated whole. I venture to say that in any one year there is an overwhelming majority of the membership of the Council fully supportive of firm concrete action against South Africa. But we realize that the pace of the Council is always determined by the slowest and most conservative mover. That is the way in which this Council's procedures are fashioned. In the case of Namibia, the pace of the Council will be determined by that permanent member which least wishes to see a change in the *status quo*.

75. Let me say this in another way. Geisa Rocha, who used to be in the secretariat of the United Nations Council for Namibia, has written in her book, *In Search of Namibian Independence*, the following:

> "It is not particularly fruitful to urge certain courses of action on an international organization or to condemn such a body for inaction or ineffectiveness if the bases of support necessary for its involvement and success do not exist. An intelligent approach to international conflict management . . . must be predicated on an understanding of the constraints imposed on international organizations by the interests and policies of those groupings of States in whose hands the destinies of these bodies rest."

Mrs. Rocha then quotes from Inis Claude, who wrote:

"[The United Nations] is above all a tool, and, like other tools, it has possibilities and limitations . . . The essential questions are: who has the handle in his grasp and what are the purposes in his mind?"

She then offers her own conclusion:

"It is my view that the predominant problem facing the international community is not how to bring about change in the attitude of the South African Government, but how to secure such changes in the policies of South Africa's major Western allies who have the handle in their grasp . . ."

76. That seems to be the real problem. It is inconceivable that an Organization of one hundred and fifty-nine independent States has to be impassive and helpless in the face of the contempt and arrogance of one. That is not the letter, nor is it the spirit of the Charter. South Africa's attitude is not the fundamental problem. If the racial configuration in South Africa as between oppressors and oppressed were the reverse of what it is now, we might already have seen that the attitude of the rulers is not the problem. The problem is that South Africa's contempt and arrogance are being tolerated by some of those who have the handles in their grasp. It is not that they do not have options. They do have options; but they have chosen to soft-pedal on South Africa.

77. Now, having established that, what does one do? Do we sit supinely back and wait for those who hold the handles to undergo change? We should not, nor can we. The Government of Guyana, for its part, will continue espousing the cause of the freedom fighters in southern Africa. We shall continue to be insistent in international forums on their behalf. The Minister for Foreign Affairs of my country, Mr. Rashleigh Jackson, declared in Georgetown on 25 May last, on the occasion of the celebration of African Liberation Day:

"For us in Guyana, the blood of the freedom fighters of Africa and Asia flows in our veins. Commencing last year and continuing for four years, we are celebrating a more than century-long existence of this connection. Their struggles have been ours and ours theirs; and in the councils of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and elsewhere, we seek common cause against colonialism, imperialism, racism and alien domination. The commitment to the struggle of those who are not yet free in Africa is thus a shared one. The People's National Congress and the Government and people of Guyana therefore have an attachment to the liberation movements which is umbilical, one which is reinforced by history and culture . . .".

78. The denial of self-determination and freedom in southern Africa is causing extensive suffering and loss of life in that region. It threatens peace and security, not only in the southern Africa region but beyond it. Those who now shield South Africa should certainly see a need to compel the Pretoria régime to dismantle its racial policies and to co-operate in Namibia's liberation so as to avoid a situation which in the long run could damage their own interests over a much wider area.

79. The situation in southern Africa will evolve its own dynamic. There are forces unleashed inside South Africa which will themselves determine in large measure the pace of change. As the late Steve Biko said:

"The winds of liberation which have been sweeping the face of Africa have reached our very borders. There is no more doubt about the inevitability of change—the only questions now remaining are 'how' and 'when'."

I go even further than Steve Biko. Those winds are now blowing already inside South Africa. Their fury will not diminish; it will grow in intensity. We are already witnessing the phenomenon and we are also seeing the results it is yielding.

80. The cost of freedom in South Africa and in Namibia will therefore be high indeed in terms of human life and human suffering. But there is still room for an intervention by the Council to reduce that cost by bringing about a peaceful solution in Namibia. The outcome is not in doubt nor can it be prevented. My delegation hopes that some of us do not lose the privilege of sharing in bringing it about.

81. After the conclusion of this debate our Secretary-General must resume his mission of contact with South Africa. That mission, difficult enough, has been made even more so by South Africa's recent actions, which reveal the absolute contempt in which the Pretoria régime holds the Organization. Guyana applauds his patience and his fortitude. He has our fullest confidence, and we pledge to him our continuing support.

82. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Yugoslavia. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

83. Mr. GOLOB (Yugoslavia): It is reassuring to see you, Sir, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago, a member of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, presiding over this series of important Council meetings. Your commitment to the cause of peace, independence and sovereignty of peoples and countries will no doubt contribute to the successful consideration of the question of Namibia. During the preparations for these meetings Mr. Alleyne, representative of Trinidad and Tobago, has amply demonstrated his dedication to the lofty ideals of the Charter of the United Nations and to the principles of the policy of non-alignment.

84. The Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand have shown competence and wisdom in guiding the deliberations of the Council in the month of May.

85. Gravely concerned over the impediments that South Africa, abetted by its allies, had defiantly strewn in the path towards genuine independence for Namibia, the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held in April at New Delhi, requested the convocation of this series of meetings of the Council [*S/17184 and Corr.1, annex,*

para. 48]. The Ministers were guided by their solidarity with the struggle of the people of Namibia for their independence and against colonial occupation, a struggle Namibians have been waging for generations.

86. The Co-ordinating Bureau invited the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of a number of non-aligned countries to participate personally in this series of meetings. However, the Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Mr. Raif Dizdarević, could not personally participate owing to previous and urgent engagements. He authorized me to speak on his behalf and upon his instructions.

87. South Africa shies from nothing to deny the people of Namibia their inalienable rights to freedom, independence and self-determination. It continues colonial occupation, terror and exploitation, causing great human suffering. It pursues the policy of *apartheid* and racial discrimination, flagrantly violating the human rights of the people of Namibia. Under pressures and threats, Namibians are forced to seek refuge in the neighbouring countries. Pretoria is conscripting Namibians in the occupying army, thus setting the stage for fratricidal war. It is recruiting mercenaries and piling up military effectives. It is using the Territory of Namibia as the springboard for aggression and subversion against independent African countries, Angola in particular.

88. The *apartheid* régime is a permanent threat to the security, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the front-line States. The latest criminal foray into independent Botswana should be met with immediate condemnation and adequate measures.

89. The human and natural resources of Namibia are being plundered by South Africa and others in defiance of the decisions of the United Nations and of Decree No. 1[3] of the United Nations Council for Namibia.

90. No attempts to quell the liberation struggle of the people of Namibia are nor will be successful. People ready to fight for self-determination and independence are invincible, and their resolve attracts an ever-growing international support. This explains the international recognition earned by the struggle of Namibia and SWAPO. It is a source of pride for us to see the President of SWAPO, Mr. Sam Nujoma, and his high-level delegation participating in the deliberations of the Council. Their struggle is central to the present and to the future of Namibia. Perseverance in and intensification of that struggle is, for the people of Namibia and for SWAPO, the only way to respond to the duplicity of South Africa and to its refusal to participate in a political settlement. Our support of that struggle is an obligation. Yugoslavia will continue to spare no effort in its support for and assistance to the people of Namibia and their sole, authentic representative, SWAPO.

91. Foreign domination in Namibia, and anywhere else in the world, poses a direct threat to international peace and security. The longer the occupation lasts, the greater the danger of drawing the issue of Namibia into bloc rivalry. The issue of Namibia is not an East-West issue. It is a matter of self-determination and independence, and let us perceive it that way.

92. The United Nations plan for Namibia is one of the remarkable achievements of the world Organization in the last decade. It ought to be defended vigorously and effectively, and it must be implemented without delay, without changes and without preconditions. The United Nations plan is a result not only of debate, but of negotiation; it is not meant to control the crisis, but to do away with it. It rests on the principles of self-determination, independence and sovereignty of peoples and countries. It is the only basis for a peaceful solution. However, its implementation is being prevented by South Africa through ever-more numerous stratagems and ploys. Irrelevant and extraneous issues, such as linkage, are being raised and rejected and condemned by the international community. So-called internal settlements are being devised based on puppet political institutions, the latest being artificially brought to life these days. It will, no doubt, meet with rejection by the international community, and rightly so.

93. All this amounts to nothing but a series of attempts by South Africa to buy time, to ride on the backs of the people of Namibia, to occupy a part of Angola and to continue to try to intimidate the front-line States.

94. A lot has been said, but not nearly enough by far has been done to implement the United Nations plan. For seven years, South Africa has been trying to shunt it aside, to push it into oblivion, and to bury it under the growing pile of prevarication, manipulation and hypocrisy. It is for the Council to cut short this seemingly endless exercise of evasion, defiance of the will of the United Nations and disregard for the decisions of the General Assembly and the Security Council.

95. We feel that it is for the Security Council to act promptly and with the necessary vigour to bring about the implementation of the United Nations plan. It should not confine itself to condemnations and appeals. It should rather adopt an action-oriented decision that would amount to renewed and strengthened pressure on South Africa. The Security Council should set a time-frame for the implementation of the plan, and should then monitor the implementation of its decisions and intervene promptly to that end.

96. If South Africa continues in its intransigence, there is no option but the imposition of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations. Furthermore, the Governments of all Member States should take appropriate legislative, administrative and other measures, pending the imposition of mandatory sanctions against South Africa, in other to isolate that country in the political, economic, military and cultural fields and in the field of sports. The Secretary-General should be given support in continuing to play an important role in the implementation of the United Nations plan.

97. In the present circumstances, the activities of the United Nations Council for Namibia have gained in impor-

tance. It is necessary to support the implementation of that Council's mandate.

98. The United Nations and the entire international community should do their best to bring independence and freedom to Namibia. That would contribute to the relaxation of tensions and to stability in international relations. At a time when belief in the United Nations is dwindling in some quarters, this would show once again that the United Nations is an indispensable forum for the solution of international issues.

99. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Hungary. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

100. Mr. FOLDEAK (Hungary): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency at a time when the United Nations is required to take crucial decisions. I am confident that your personal qualities and diplomatic skill will contribute to the successful outcome of the debate on the important issue before the Council.

101. I should like also to express our appreciation to your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, for the successful manner in which he conducted the affairs of the Council during the month of May.

102. Let me express the gratitude of my delegation to the members of the Council for having given me the opportunity to participate in this debate.

103. My delegation has been following carefully the events in South Africa during the past months. Since the introduction of the so-called constitutional reforms last September, the tension in that country has been increasing constantly. The oppressive apparatus of the racist State is becoming more and more aggressive and violent against the majority of the population of the country. The result is more killings, more victims and more tension. It is no exaggeration to say that the racist State is at war with its own population. That situation was discussed in the Council not long ago.

104. This time the Council is dealing with another aspect of the behaviour of the racist régime of South Africa: the obstruction of Council resolutions, which are binding on Member States. The latest manoeuvres by Pretoria to introduce an interim administration in Namibia, however, go beyond simple obstruction: they constitute a serious violation of Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978). South Africa has no right to take any unilateral measures in Namibia outside the scope of the relevant United Nations resolutions. My delegation absolutely condemns the establishment of an interim government in Namibia with the involvement of the so-called Multi-Party Conference, which is a puppet of Pretoria and represents no one.

105. My delegation has studied carefully the report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) on the question of Namibia [*S/17242*] in which the Secretary-General states that in spite of resolution 539 (1983), which rejected the linkage issue, South Africa still insists that the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is a precondition for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978). Because of that intransigent position, the United Nations plan has remained unimplemented.

106. In paragraph 8 of its resolution 539 (1983), the Council called upon South Africa

> "to communicate to [the Secretary-General] its choice of the electoral system in order to facilitate the immediate and unconditional implementation of the United Nations plan embodied in Security Council resolution 435 (1978)".

South Africa has ignored this call as well.

107. During the past two decades, the rulers of Pretoria have furnished ample evidence that they cannot be considered reliable partners in any negotiating process. Their obsession with *apartheid* prevents them from accepting the logic of fairness, decency and justice. They will not change as long as they feel the presence of the protective shield of veto in this Council.

108. My delegation believes the time has come when Pretoria must be faced with decisive, united action by the Council. It is time to use the power of comprehensive mandatory sanctions under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations if South Africa does not comply with resolutions and continues to obstruct the implementation of the United Nations plan.

109. Namibia must be free without further delay. The independence of the last major colonial Territory involves the most fundamental principles on which the United Nations is based and which must be respected by all of its Member States.

110. It is the firm conviction of my delegation, and of the vast majority of delegations that have spoken before the Council, that the Pretoria régime could not defy the resolutions of the United Nations and the will of the international community without the support of its allies, first and foremost the United States. The policy of so-called constructive engagement has led to disastrous consequences in terms of a general worsening of the situation in the southern Africa region, in terms of the loss of more human lives and in terms of more reckless disregard of United Nations resolutions by the racist régime of South Africa.

111. The latest example of the aggressive policy of South Africa is the armed incursion into Botswana, a peaceful neighbouring country. This armed aggression cannot be justified. It is a serious violation of the sovereignty of an independent State. My delegation strongly condemns this brutal act of aggression.

112. We firmly believe that Pretoria must not be given any more support from any quarter. This time South Africa

must be confronted with decisive and unified action by the Security Council. There should not be any encouraging signals for Pretoria, for that would only further delay the implementation of the United Nations plan.

113. With the exception of South Africa, all parties concerned have demonstrated flexibility and readiness to implement resolution 435 (1978), the only acceptable basis for the settlement of the question of Namibia. The Government of Angola and the leadership of SWAPO have participated in the negotiating process with good faith and a genuine desire to solve the problem. My delegation expresses appreciation for their constructive approach.

114. I also take this opportunity to assure the people of Namibia and its sole, legitimate representative, SWAPO, of the support and solidarity of the people and the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic. My country will, as in the past, continue to render all kinds of support for its just struggle for independence.

115. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Congo. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

116. Mr. GAYAMA (Congo) (*interpretation from French*): Mr. President, since I am speaking at this late stage in the work of the Security Council, the Congolese delegation is happy to express to you, quite advisedly, congratulations and sincere admiration for the way in which you have been conducting the deliberations of this important United Nations body. I am pleased that the Minister for Foreign Affairs of a fraternal country friendly to the African continent, Trinidad and Tobago, has assumed the role of President of the Council at a time when the Council is dealing with the question of Namibia. This is a question that is as dear to you as it is to us, and we know that you will take the opportunity to bring to bear your well-known experience and talent to ensure the successful outcome of these deliberations.

117. I wish also to pay a tribute to your predecessors, the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand, who guided the work of the Council with great talent last month, thereby contributing to the universal respect this body commands.

118. The efforts made by the Secretary-General since the beginning of his mandate to try to resolve the Namibian crisis are familiar to us all. We should like to thank him and to encourage him to continue his work to make it possible one day—as soon as possible—to celebrate Namibia's accession to international sovereignty. The current meetings should be a decisive landmark in that regard.

119. On the subject of decisive landmarks in the history of Namibia, there is a very compelling one whose significance for the history of Namibia speaks for itself—is the commemoration this year of the one-hundredth anniversary of the Act adopted in 1885 at the Berlin Conference, whereby Africa was carved up and subjugated, thus institutionalizing within the context of "might is right" a process that began in the sixteenth century with the systematic plunder of the human and material resources of the continent, the consequences of which are still felt to this day.

120. A few months ago the People's Republic of the Congo hosted an International Seminar on the Berlin Conference, thus stressing how the lessons learned from this commemoration could shed light on the present situation.

121. My delegation is laying stress on this one-hundredth anniversary because of its direct bearing on what was then called South West Africa. It was in the capial of imperial Germany that the fate of the Territory was sealed, and the colonial method chosen for Namibia was one of the most barbaric conceivable. It involved quite simply the genocide of indigenous peoples—the Hereros and the Ovambos, in particular. Tens of thousands of people were massacred in a very short period of time before the First World War, simply to create space for the occupiers and to exploit the grazing, mining and other resources of the country. Whereas elsewhere the end of the war brought with it a taste of freedom for the stricken peoples, the same could not be said for the people of Namibia, which went from Scylla to Charybdis—from the bloody hands of an imperial European Power into the hands of a gang of bigots then installed in South Africa and determined to assert their principal virtues, scorn and cruelty. The rest is history. Despite the celebration this year of the fortieth anniversary of the signing of the Charter of the United Nations, which marked for the world the advent of a new international order, and despite the 25 years that have elapsed since the adoption of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the Namibian people is still languishing in the dark ages of the old order. Like the neighbouring South African people living under the régime of *apartheid*, it suffered the application of Nazi principles and the Nazi order that had prevailed during the Second Word War and, as is well known, were condemned at the Nuremberg trials.

122. The anachronism, the violation of the norms and principles of international law, and the non-implementation of the relevant General Assembly and Security Council decisions are today the features and the symbols of a situation purposely maintained by South Africa.

123. After 100 years of colonization, we are still haggling over the accession of a people to self-determination and independence. The fact that the question of Namibia has been on the General Assembly's agenda since the founding of the United Nations has apparently had no decisive effect on finding a solution to the problem. The fortieth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations should remind all Member States of the need to return to the Organization its original spirit, so that it can once again serve "We the peoples of the United Nations", as mentioned in the preamble of the Charter, instead of following the present course characterized by the selfish interests of a few.

124. Indeed, in legal terms the United Nations could do no less than what it did when it terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia and designated the United Nations

Council for Namibia as the legal Administering Authority of the Territory and, more particularly, when it adopted the settlement plan for Namibia contained in resolution 435 (1978).

125. The only thing missing here is action. In this regard, the obstacles have been fully identified. South Africa is undoubtedly the main obstacle; but Pretoria is not alone. Its support for the implementation of the settlement plan was shelved the day when the Western Powers—from which it gains most of its support—had imposed on them by one member a strange linkage between the implementation of the settlement plan and the domestic situation in Angola, a sovereign country of the United Nations.

126. However, at the present stage of the question's consideration, the United Nations can do nothing but ensure the implementation of its plan. It would be a shameful affront to the memory of so many Namibian martyrs, including women and children of Kassinga, to impose more on that people which has made all possible concessions through SWAPO, its sole, authentic representative, on the strength of the contact group's commitment to promote a peaceful solution of the problem.

127. The legitimacy of the aspirations and the magnitude of the sacrifice endured by the Namibian people should be reflected, we feel, in a genuine return to the spirit and the letter of resolution 435 (1978). We therefore appeal to those States which have acknowledged that they have some influence on the Pretoria Government not to give it too easy alibis to behave as it wishes outside the international consensus. We also express our gratitude to the members of the Western contact group—to the extent that that group still exists—which, to be honest, have dissociated themselves from the manoeuvres that could have taken them too far in an unworthy compromise with the South African régime.

128. The acts of piracy of which South Africa was recently guilty in the north of Angola, in Cabinda, reveal the arrogant scorn shown by the *apartheid* régime for international opinion while it relies on the benevolent understanding of some who consider those acts to be nothing more than pursuit of its enemies. For the needs of the cause, South Africa and the strategists of East-West confrontation are ready to invent enemies outside instead of determining the true source within the *apartheid* régime itself, which is the permanent threat to international peace and security.

129. All those factors can only further the perpetration of acts of bravado like the decision to impose upon Namibia a so-called internal administration, without any democratic basis or juridical recognition than that of the occupying Power from which it emanates.

130. This situation cannot go on without further endangering an already endangered future, given the accumulation of hard feelings. But, as recognized by the final act of the Seminar of Brazzaville to which I referred before, while the Berlin Conference sowed division and the seeds of desolation, the duty of present generations is to rebuild in unity and understanding something to prevent the maintenance of an unjustified and unjustifiable *status quo*—because it is clear that we can expect no positive, conciliatory gesture from the southern part of the African continent dominated by the *apartheid* régime. International peace and security are directly threatened by the aggressive policies which are acts of defiance by Pretoria against the United Nations and the whole world.

131. The unprovoked attack launched last Friday against Botswana resulting in 11 deaths, many wounded and material damage that has not yet been estimated—this at the very time that the Council was meeting to consider the situation—for which South Africa's responsibility is quite clear, is additional proof of Pretoria's so-called good faith. This act, as everyone knows, is not the first and it will not be the last, particularly if Pretoria thinks it is above any kind of sanctions. Whether it uses clandestine procedures as in the Angolan province of Cabinda or throws off its mask and openly attacks others as it did in Gaborone, South Africa is consistent—that is, it does nothing that promotes peace.

132. The conditions for imposing mandatory sanctions against South Africa under Chapter VII of the Charter are there. It only remains now for the Council to draw the necessary conclusions. Not to impose those sanctions in the present circumstances would be to give the *apartheid* régime a kind of hallmark of respectability that would render meaningless the main organ responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security and thus give free rein to disorder and insecurity everywhere in the world.

133. Everyone will therefore understand that we are exhorting the international community to increase manifold assistance to SWAPO so that the Namibian people can wage its struggle until the inevitable victory over colonialism and oppression is won.

134. The Congo has always supported the need to strengthen the Namibian people's ability to wage the struggle through its sole, authentic representative, SWAPO. That was in fact one of the basic recommendations and conclusions of another seminar on the subject, the Seminar on the Intensification of International Action for the Immediate Independence of Namibia, which was also held at Brazzaville last March. "Namibia represents an extreme case of colonialism characterized by brutal oppression, exploitation and denial of basic rights of the Namibian people by the illegal occupation régime of South Africa",[4] was the unequivocal message of the participants in that Seminar.

135. It is clear from these deliberations that there is an overwhelming and constant commitment on the part of the Member States to the ideal of an independent Namibia—an ideal shared by all peoples of the United Nations. It is for us on this fortieth anniversary of the adoption of the Charter to ensure the final universalization of this idea. In so doing we would be fulfilling the expectations of the non-aligned countries, which initiated the convening of this series of meetings following the Extra-

ordinary Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau, held at New Delhi last April. I take this opportunity to address our congratulations to the Ministers for Foreign Affairs, whose participation in the Council's work has conferred upon this body a very special impact.

136. Mr. HUANG Jiahua (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has already made a statement with regard to the question of Namibia [*2584th meeting*]. We should now like to state our position on South Africa's invasion of Botswana.

137. Just as the Council is debating the issue of Namibia and condemning South Africa for its continued illegal occupation of Namibia and its incessant subversion of the security of neighbouring countries, the South African authorities have once again launched an invasion into Botswana. That act not only seriously violates the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Botswana, but also constitutes an open challenge to the international community as a whole. The Chinese Government and people express the utmost indignation over, and the strongest condemnation of, South Africa's act of aggression. We also express our deep sympathy for, and solidarity with, the Government and people of Botswana.

138. On 15 June a spokesman of the Chinese Ministry for Foreign Affairs made the following statement about the incident:

> "In the small hours of 14 June South African troops outrageously invaded Gaborone, the capital of Botswana, killing 12 people, wounding many more and destroying some houses and motor vehicles. That was a brazen encroachment upon the sovereignty and territorial integrity of an independent State by the South African authorities and a flagrant provocation against the African countries and peoples. The Chinese Government and people express great indignation over that act and strong condemnation of it.
>
> "The raid upon Botswana by the South African authorities is not an isolated incident: the facts have proved time and again that the root cause of the turbulent and unstable situation in southern Africa lies in the South African authorities' stubborn pursuit of the practice of racism and the policy of destabilizing the neighbouring countries. The South African authorities' perverse acts will only arouse stronger resistance and greater indignation among the African countries and peoples.
>
> "The struggle of Botswana, Angola, Mozambique and the other African front-line States to combat racism, safeguard their sovereignty and territorial integrity and support the Namibian people's fight for independence has won sympathy and support from all the justice-upholding countries and peoples in the world. The Chinese Government and people will, as always, stand firmly by the African countries and peoples and resolutely support their just struggle."

The meeting rose at 1.05 p.m.

NOTES

[1] A/AC.109/830.

[2] *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council resolution 276 (1970), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports, 1971*, p. 16.

[3] Decree No. 1 for the Protection of the Natural Resources of Namibia, enacted by the United Nations Council for Namibia on 27 September 1974 (*Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth session, Supplement No. 24* (A/35/24), vol. I, annex II).

[4] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fortieth session, Supplement No. 23* (A/40/23), chap. IX, para. 12).

Litho in United Nations, New York 00300 90-61439—April 1994—2,050